



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,378	09/30/2003	Peter Schwarze	13914-023001 / 2003P00069	3243
32864 7590 02/04/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER DUNHAM, JASON B				
ART UNIT 3625		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 02/04/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,378

Applicant(s)

SCHWARZE ET AL.

Examiner

JASON B. DUNHAM

Art Unit

3625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-15, 17-29 and 31-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-15, 17-29 and 31-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/888)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-8, 15, 17-22, 29, and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schwarzhoff (US 6,591,260).

Referring to claim 1. Schwarzhoff discloses a method of conducting an electronic purchasing process comprising:

- Initiating an electronic purchasing process on a purchasing computer system having an internal contact directory hosted by a service provider of the purchasing computer system (Schwarzhoff: abstract, figure 3, and column 7, line 49 – column 8, line 36 disclosing an entity manger (i.e. internal contact directory)).
- Establishing communication, by the purchasing computing system, with an external contact directory of suppliers and information relating to the suppliers, the external contact directory hosted by an external service provider that is not the service provider of the purchasing computing system (Schwarzhoff: figure 3, element 308 directory service);

- Sending a request from the purchasing computing system and to the external contact directory, the request identifying a user selected one of the suppliers included in the external contact directory (Schwarzhoff: figure 3, and column 7, line 49 – column 8, line 36);
- Receiving, in a format compliant with a partner interface protocol, a response from the external directory and at the purchasing computing system, the response including information relating to the selected supplier (Schwarzhoff: figure 3, and column 7, line 49 – column 8, line 36);
- Parsing the information in the received response (Schwarzhoff: figure 3, and column 7, line 49 – column 8, line 36);
- Creating, using the information parsed from the response, a new business partner entry in the internal directory, the new business partner entry for the selected supplier (Schwarzhoff: figure 3, and column 7, line 49 – column 8, line 36);and
- Assigning the selected supplier as a source of supply in the purchasing process (Schwarzhoff: column 7, line 49 – column 8, line 36 disclosing facilitating transactions between trading partners).

Referring to claim 3. Schwarzhoff further discloses a method wherein said creating of the new business partner entry comprises mapping the parsed information into fields according to the partner interface protocol (Schwarzhoff: figure 3, and column 7, line 49 – column 8, line 36).

Referring to claims 4-5. Schwarzhoff further discloses a method of sending responses between partners comprising html or xml pages (Schwarzhoff: abstract and column 4, lines 16-39).

Referring to claims 6-8. Schwarzhoff further discloses a method wherein comprising:

- The electronic purchasing process requires a business partner (Schwarzhoff: abstract and figure 1).
- Completing the electronic purchasing process with the new business partner entry (Schwarzhoff: abstract disclosing conducting commercial transactions).
- Generating a purchase order using the new business partner entry (Schwarzhoff: figure 2);

Referring to claims 15, 17-22, 29, and 31-36. Claims 15, 17-22, 29, and 31-36 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above as Schwarzhoff discloses systems and mediums for enabling the method claims 1-3 and 6-8.

Claims 9-14, 23-28, and 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwarzhoff (US 6,591,260) in view of Stone (US 2002/0107889).

Referring to claims 9-14, 23-28, and 37-42. Schwarzhoff discloses all of the above as noted under the 102(e) rejection but does not expressly disclose flagging documents while determining authority. Stone discloses a method comprising:

- Determining whether a user who initiated and is controlling the electronic purchasing process has authority to approve the new business partner entry (Stone: abstract and paragraph 49).
- Flagging the new business partner entry as incomplete in response to determining the user does not have said authority (Stone: paragraphs 34 and 45-49). The examiner notes that Stone discloses directing reports to persons who have the proper authority.
- Generating a purchasing document with said new business partner entry and flagging the purchase document as on hold (Stone: figure 1 and paragraph 54). The purchase document would be on hold till the proper person with authority authorizes the order.
- Determining an authorized approver for the new business partner entry (Stone: abstract and paragraph 49).
- Generating an approval workflow item for the authorized approver (Stone: figure 3 and paragraph 52).
- Deleting the new business partner entry from the internal directory in response to the authorized approver not approving the new business partner entry (Stone: paragraphs 34 and 46). Stone discloses flagging non-removable attributes, it would have been obvious to allow authorized approvers (such as the head of purchasing in paragraph 54) to delete removable entries.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to have modified the method of Schwarzhoff to have included

flagging documents while determining authority, as taught by Stone, in order to determine access authorization and routing information for data transmitted from partners (Stone: paragraphs 23 and 29). Claims 23-28 and 37-42 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 10, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Schwarzhoff does not disclose initiating an electronic purchasing process on a purchasing computer system having an internal contact directory and establishing communication with an external contact directory of suppliers. The examiner disagrees. Applicant's specification defines directories (without mention of "contact") as database of trading partner information wherein an external directory contains information on potential new partners and an internal directory may contain information on partners that were previously used and have been approved (paragraphs 18 and 25). Schwarzhoff discloses an entity manager that acts as an internal database for receiving trading partner (such as sellers) documents (through URN's) from the external directory (see at least figure 3) in a schema to identify the transaction (i.e. compliant format). The examiner further notes column 11, lines 26-41 disclosing trading partners modifying their internal repositories while leaving the external central directory unmodified. Independent claims 1, 15, and 29 as well as their respective dependents are rejected under this rationale.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON B. DUNHAM whose telephone number is (571)272-8109. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Smith can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey A. Smith/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3625

JBD
1/28/09